Multi-family Residential Standards

The more I focus on the bizarre height standard in R3W and R4W, the density cap formulas in R3W and R3U, and the old university-proximate parking standards, the more I realize we need a major overhaul of the R3s. Here's what we've got right now:

R3:
- Allowed everywhere except West Lafayette
- No density cap
- Front setbacks? Standard (25' to 60' based on road classification)
- Minimum lot area: 2000 sq.ft. per each of the first 3 d.u., then 1000 sq.ft. per each d.u. above 3
- Height maximum of 35' (or to original height if being repaired, or restored)
- UZO 4-5-1c applies, meaning any building can gain 2' of additional height for each 1' of additional setback
- Parking for Multi-family: in Lafayette its 1.5 per efficiency & 1 BR unit, 1.75 per 2 BR, 2.0 per 3+ BR unit; in the County its 2 spaces per dwelling unit

R3U:
- Allowed in both cities, incorporated towns, & unincorporated towns with sewer, but only within the urbanized, sewered areas
- Density cap formula in place…no more than 15 units per acre (really? In a U district?)
- Front setbacks? 15'
- Minimum lot area: same as R3
- Height maximum of 35' (or to original height if being repaired, or restored)
- UZO 4-5-1c applies, meaning any building can gain 2' of additional height for each 1' of additional setback (again…really?)
- Parking for Multi-family: same as R3

So…apart from where they can be located, there are basically no differences in R3 and R3U except building setbacks and the presence of the density cap in R3U. Why do we want the R3 apartments to be denser than R3U apartments? And why do we allow height to get higher if the building is setback farther in R3U? Don't we want buildings in our urban areas to be closer to their lot lines and not farther away? OK, going on…

R3W:

- Allowed only in West Lafayette
- Density cap formula in place…no more than 15 units per acre
- Front setbacks? Same as R3
- Minimum lot area: same as R3 except for university-proximate residences… which get a slight break in this standard:

UNIT TYPE	LIVING AREA (sq.ft.)	*LOT AREA,* EACH OF FIRST 3 UNITS	*LOT AREA,* EACH ADDITIONAL UNIT
A	825 and over	2000 sq.ft.	1000 sq.ft.
B	650 - 824	1500	1000
C	470 - 649	1200	750
D	under 470	1000	500
Efficiency	---	800	500

For ***university-proximate multi-family*** projects containing more than one unit type, the 3 largest units shall be used to calculate "***lot area***, each of first 3 units". See 4-3 for additional information.

- Height maximum: 14' at the finished floor of the upper story
- UZO 4-5-1c does not apply (no height bonuses allowed for bigger setbacks)
- Parking for Multi-family: 2 spaces per dwelling unit except university-proximate residences which gives us another lovely chart as follows:

UNIT TYPE	LIVING AREA (sq.ft.)	AUTO *PARKING SPACES* (per unit)
A	825 and over	3.0
B	650 - 824	2.25
C	470 - 649	1.6
D	under 470	1.1
Efficiency	------	1.0

R4W:

- Perfectly replicates R3W except for the absence of the density cap formula (actually it includes the density cap formula, but instead of a ***maximum*** density, it calculates the ***minimum*** density at 15.01)

Now then, we have talked about changing R3W and R4W's height to 35' (which is the most common height standard - All residential uses have a height limit of 35' except in CB where the height max for all uses is 100'.) We have also talked about eliminating the need for R4W entirely by changing the density cap formula and allowing a much higher density by right in R3W. And we would like to look at updating parking standards.

So here are my questions for discussion purposes, in no particular order…

1. Do we really need separate R3 zones for Lafayette and West Lafayette and what should those differences be?
2. Would it make more sense to have an R3U in the urban areas of both Lafayette and West Lafayette (or if necessary, R3U in Lafayette and R3W in the univ-prox areas) and an R3 in the more suburban areas like we did with MR/MRU?

3. Shouldn't the R3U zone allow the most density rather than R3?

4. Do we want to keep 4-5-1c (the one foot over, two feet up rule)? (This, actually, covers all buildings, not just apartment buildings, in every zone except R3W and R4W.) My personal opinion is that it just shouldn't apply in our U zones where we want smaller setbacks, not greater.

5. Time to discuss parking. Sigh. Do we still want 1 parking space per bedroom as the standard? This can *dramatically increase* the number of required parking spaces…but then again it can also *decrease* the number of required spaces. It all depends on the size of the apartment units. For an example, let's look at a recent variance case (BZA-1853) at 249 Littleton St. in West Lafayette…

Type A units:	3
Type B units:	16
Type C units:	1
Total units:	20

   By Lafayette's R3 parking standards, 39 spaces are required.
   By the County's 2 per du standard, 40 spaces are required.
   Using University-proximate standards, 47 spaces are required.
   At one space per bedroom, 60 spaces are required.

   BTW, they got the variance to allow a total of 35 spaces instead of the 47 parking spaces current regulations require. I'm just pointing this out because the petitioner used the argument that they weren't increasing the number of bedrooms and that's how PD parking standards are negotiated…but using those PD parking standards, they provide way below what they should have (60 spaces). Is one per bedroom (gasp!) too much?

   The other side of that coin is the 720 Northwestern PD, which was of course, a much bigger project, but that shouldn't matter as far as parking ratios…goes.

Type A units:	146
Type B units:	38
Type C units:	10
Type E units:	57
Total units:	251

   By Lafayette's R3 parking standards, 459 spaces are required.
   By the County's 2 per du standard, 502 spaces are required.
   Using University-proximate standards, 600 spaces are required.
   And at one space per bedroom, 558 spaces are required.

   In this case, because the unit sizes are much larger than the previous example with a majority of A units rather than B units, university-proximate had the highest parking space requirement. So with larger unit size (and larger bedrooms) one space per bedroom is…as Goldilocks would say…just right.

   Suggestions?